

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 90388

Title: Cardiac remodeling in patients with atrial fibrillation reversing bradycardia-induced cardiomyopathy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03604107

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Albania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-18 18:18

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-24 19:06

Review time: 6 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a very interesting case report. However, it needs major revision, especially regarding the timeline of the events. It is extremely hard to follow - and prove - things that have happened in 1981, i.e. more than forty years from now. I highly appreciate this serious attempt, but documenting medical problems of forty years before is a problem. Furthermore, medicine was not at the actual level of sophistication. The sequence of events - as described - is even more bizarre: The patient, a nulliparous female (G1, P0) of unspecified occupation, exhibited normal development and was born on March 27, 1973..... So you, initially speak about nulliparity, than give the date of birth ?? Please mind the calendar.... Even more, giving precise details (date of birth etc....) might lead to unacceptable ethical issue due to potential identification of the patient. Ensure anonimity. The formule regarding menstruation is not understandable. Figure 1 is overlapped and unclear: please separate these into two-three clear insets.